



General Assembly

Sixty-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
9 December 2013

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 36th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 14 November 2013, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Diallo (Senegal)

Contents

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)(a) International trade and development (*continued*)Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind
(*continued*)(j) The role of the international community in the prevention of the radiation
threat in Central Asia (*continued*)Agenda item 61: Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied
Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the
occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org/>).

13-56484 (E)



Please recycle A small graphic of a recycling symbol, consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions
(continued)

(a) International trade and development
(continued) (A/C.2/68/L.12 and A/C.2/68/L.29)

Draft decision on the venue of the fourteenth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in 2016 (A/C.2/68/L.29)

1. **The Chair** said that the draft decision had no programme budget implications.

2. *Draft decision A/C.2/68/L.29 was adopted.*

Draft resolution on unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries (A/C.2/68/L.12)

3. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

4. **Ms. Melnikovich** (Belarus) said that individual States had used unilateral coercive economic measures as a foreign policy tool to advance their own interests, thereby undermining the economic and social rights of peoples under sanctions. The United Nations must ensure that such measures were repealed. The draft resolution should send a clear message to States that continued to impose sanctions and blockades and act against international law and international human rights law. Her delegation therefore wished to join the sponsors.

5. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had also joined the sponsors.

6. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran

(Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

7. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.12 was adopted by 124 votes to 2, with 52 abstentions.*

8. **Ms. Derderian** (United States of America) said that her country believed that each Member State had the sovereign right to decide how it conducted trade with other countries, including by restricting trade in certain circumstances. Economic sanctions, whether unilateral or multilateral, were often a successful means of achieving foreign policy objectives. The

United States considered its sanctions carefully and used them with specific objectives in mind, including as a means to promote a return to the rule of law or democracy or in response to threats to international security. The United States was within its rights in using its trade and commercial policy as tools for noble objectives. In effect, the draft resolution sought to limit the international community's ability to respond by non-violent means to threats to democracy, human rights or global security. The United States had therefore requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution and voted against it.

9. **Mr. Levickas** (Lithuania), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that his delegation and those of the countries on whose behalf he spoke had abstained in the vote. Unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)
(A/C.2/68/L.26)

Draft resolution on the oil slick on Lebanese shores
(A/C.2/68/L.26)

10. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

11. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain,

Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Tonga.

12. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.26 was adopted by 165 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions.*

13. **Mr. Golan** (Israel) said that the draft resolution had no place in a professional forum. It was counterproductive, one-sided, distorted and deeply political. Despite giving every detail of the oil spill, it provided no context for Israel's actions. It set a precedent for other States to act aggressively and then claim damages when their neighbours reacted in self-defence.

14. The text failed to mention that Hizbullah had kidnapped and killed Israeli soldiers on 12 July 2006 and fired over 6,000 rockets into northern Israel over the following days. The rockets had ruined 16,500 acres of forests and grazing land, destroying 1 million trees; but the authors of the draft resolution valued environmental protection only when it could be exploited to defame Israel.

15. The text also neglected Israel's extensive cooperation with the United Nations Environment Programme and other organizations to address the situation on the Lebanese coast. In the wake of the oil spill, Israel had immediately responded to requests from the Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean Sea by assisting and issuing permits for the aerial photography flights requested by international agencies. Israel had passed on satellite data to Cyprus and offered assistance to Lebanon.

16. The draft resolution put forward an alternative history in which Israel was an unjust aggressor and the horrific terrorism of Hizbullah did not deserve a mention. His delegation had therefore requested a vote and voted against it.

17. **Mr. Mohamad** (Lebanon) said that the draft resolution was based not on information from the Government of Lebanon, but rather on the findings of the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/544), which stated that the marine oil spill caused by the destruction of the oil storage tanks at the Jiyeh electric power plant by the Israeli Air Force had resulted in the release of about 15,000 tons of fuel oil into the Mediterranean Sea, leading to the contamination of about 150 km of coastline in Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic with an adverse impact on the environment and the achievement of sustainable development. Moreover, Israel had hindered efforts to contain the oil spill in the early stages, thereby prolonging its adverse effects. Israel's responsibility to provide compensation was unquestionable.

18. The representative of Israel contended that the draft resolution had no place in the Committee's work. That claim was misleading and invalid; the Committee's mandate included sustainable development, economic growth and environmental protection, all of which had been affected by the oil slick. It was in fact the delegation of Israel that had politicized the issue. That delegation ought rather to read the text of the draft resolution, something it appeared not to have done.

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind (*continued*)
(A/C.2/68/L.19 and A/C.2/68/L.44)

Draft resolution on the protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind
(A/C.2/68/L.19 and A/C.2/68/L.44)

19. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.44, which had been submitted by Ms. Hay (New Zealand), Rapporteur, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.19 and had no programme budget implications. He took it that the Committee agreed to waive the 24-hour provision of rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

20. *It was so decided.*

21. **Mr. Farrukh Iqbal Khan** (Pakistan) introduced minor drafting changes to the draft resolution.

22. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.44 was adopted with minor drafting changes.*

23. **Ms. Derderian** (United States of America) said that her country had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because it was committed to working towards the conclusion in 2015 of an ambitious, durable and flexible climate change agreement applicable to all parties. However, in its reference to common but differentiated responsibilities, paragraph 10 of the resolution perpetuated a distinction that did not reflect global scientific realities. Her delegation understood the term "common but differentiated responsibilities" as referring to a continuum of responsibilities and capabilities that could evolve over time. Other interpretations of the term undermined the objective of the Convention and called into question its relevance. Paragraph 10 should therefore not be interpreted in a manner inconsistent with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change or

the Cancun Agreements, which set out climate change mitigation measures on which the international community should seek to build. In the same way, the reference in paragraph 15 to the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action had no effect on the agreed mandate for negotiations.

24. The phrase “protection of the integrity of Mother Earth” introduced a specific cultural reference that was not universally accepted. Her delegation understood it as referring to the importance of protecting the Earth.

25. **Ms. Onishi** (Japan) said that paragraph 10 of the draft resolution contained language inconsistent with the Convention; her delegation understood that the latter would prevail. In the same way, the final lines of paragraph 15 should not be construed as affecting the agreed mandate for negotiations.

26. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.19 was withdrawn.*

(j) The role of the international community in the prevention of the radiation threat in Central Asia *(continued)* (A/C.2/68/L.36)

Draft resolution on the role of the international community in averting the radiation threat in Central Asia (A/C.2/68/L.36)

27. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

28. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Azerbaijan, Canada and the United States of America had joined the sponsors.

29. **Mr. Kasymov** (Kyrgyzstan) introduced a minor drafting change to the draft resolution, whose sponsors had been joined by the Republic of Moldova.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.36 was adopted with minor drafting changes.*

31. **Mr. Kasymov** (Kyrgyzstan) said that he hoped that the draft resolution would send a strong positive message and provide a basis for assistance to countries in need, such as his own.

Agenda item 61: Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources *(continued)* (A/C.2/68/L.27)

Draft resolution on the permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources (A/C.2/68/L.27)

32. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

33. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the sponsors had been joined by Brunei Darussalam, Namibia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Zimbabwe.

34. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the

Grenadines, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Honduras, Jamaica, Malawi, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Tonga.

35. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.27 was adopted by 162 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.*

36. **Mr. Golan** (Israel) said that his delegation had requested a vote and voted against the draft resolution. The Committee had once again chosen to take a detour from its important work in order to engage in a meaningless annual exercise. At a time when the Organization's resources were scarce, it had wasted its time discussing a one-sided, biased text. It was saddening that so many Committee members were prepared to allow the agenda to be hijacked. The draft resolution did nothing to encourage reconciliation or to improve life on the ground. Instead, it was designed to foment division and to allow delegations motivated by anti-Israelism to disparage his country.

37. The outstanding issues between Israel and the Palestinians should be resolved through bilateral negotiations. Israel's hand remained outstretched to the Palestinians and Member States. His country stood prepared to share its knowledge and experience, and would focus on providing technology for developing countries.

38. **Mr. AlHantouli** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that the draft resolution, adopted with overwhelming support, reiterated the right of the Palestinian people to sovereignty over its natural

resources, which were fundamental for development. The draft resolution urged Israel to stop expropriating Palestinian land and water, destroying agriculture and polluting the environment. It took a clear stand in favour of international law and against Israel's colonial occupation of the Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the occupied Syrian Golan.

39. Twenty-five years after the adoption of the Palestinian Declaration of Independence, the reality on the ground had not changed. Israel's outstretched hand brought with it confiscations, settlements, the separation wall, the destruction of resources and collective punishment. Against that background, the international community had a responsibility to take action.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.